


Fulton Leroy Washington  
Federal No. 08204-112  
U.S. Penitentiary  
3901 Klein Blvd  
Lompoc, CA 93436-2706

in Pro Se



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

United States Of America,	)	CASE NO: CV-01-08491-DDP
Plaintiff/Respondent,	)	[CR-96-557-DDP] ✓
	)	
vs.	)	NOTICE OF MOTION PURSUANT
	)	TO ALL WRITS ACT 28 U.S.C.
Fulton Leroy Washington,	)	§ 1651(a)
Defendant/Petitioner.	)	
	)	


NOTICE OF MOTION HEARING FOR  
WRIT OF AUDITA QUERELA

TO: Assistant United States Attorney, Patrick Fitzgerald, Counsel  
For Plaintiff:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on November 24, 2008, at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as he may be heard, in the courtroom of Honorable Dean D. Pregerson, United States District Court Judge for the Central District of California, Pro Se defendant Fulton Leroy Washington ("Petitioner") will move the Court through these pleadings for a Writ of Audita Querela pursuant to All Writs Act 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) to fill gaps in the existing post-conviction remedial framework and be granted relief of sentence imposed in error.

DATED: OCTOBER 31, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Fulton Leroy Washington, Pro Se

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE</b>
Table Of Authorities	ii
Memorandum Of Points And Authorities	1
Preface	1
Authorization To File Audita Querela/Generally	2
Jurisdiction	2
Pro Se Status	2
Request For Appointment Of Counsel	3
Request For Evidentiary Hearing	3
Related Cases	4
Introduction	5
Factual Statement And Summary Of Prior Proceedings	5
Arguments	7
Writ Of Audita Querela	8
Gaps In Post Conviction Remedial Framework	11
A) Gap At Circuit Court Level	11
B) Gap At The District Court Level	12
C) A Gap Exists In The Post Conviction Remedial Framework If F.R.Civ.P. Rule 63 Does Not Apply To Post Conviction Proceedings...	13
Legal Defects In Sentence That Taint Conviction	
A) Jurisdictional Defect	15
B) Structural Defect	18
Washington's Sentence Is Grossly Disproportionate To His Charged Conduct And Pleads For A Humane Sentence	22
Conclusion	24
<i>Appendix and Exhibits</i>	
CERTIFICATE AND PROOF OF SERVICE	

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u> , 530 U.S. 466 (2004)	
pg(s) 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 18, 21, 22, 23	
<u>Bousley v. United States</u> , 523 U.S. 614, 620 (1998)	
pg. 10	
<u>Carrington v. United States</u> , 503 F.3d 880,890 n.2 (9th Cir. 2007)	
pg(s) 7, 8, 14, 15	
<u>Davis</u> , 453 U.S. at 374-75 (1982)	
pg. 23	
<u>New York Life Insurance Co. v. Brown</u> , 84 F.3d (5th Cir. 1996)	
pg(s) 16-17	
<u>DOE v. I.N.S.</u> , 120 F.3d 200 (9th Cir. 1997)	
pg(s) 2, 14, 15	
<u>Ezelona v. I.N.S.</u> , <u>Dept. Of Homeland Sec.</u> 355 F.3d 539(6th Cir.2004)	
pg. 9	
<u>Gall v. United States</u> , 128 S.Ct. 558, 574, 169 L.Ed 2d 481	
pg. 13	(Dec. 10, 2007)
<u>Gonzales v. Crosby</u> , 125 S.Ct. 2641, 2645-46 n(2005)	
pg. 16, 17	
<u>Griffith v. Kentucky</u> , 479 U.S. 314, 328 (1987)	
pg(s) 7, 10, 22	
<u>Haines v. Kerner</u> , 404 U.S. 519(1972)	
pg. 2	
<u>Hammel v. Michigan</u> , 501 U.S. 957, 1001 (1991)	
pg. 23	
<u>In Re Winship</u>	
pg(s) 3, 18	
<u>Kimbrough v. United States</u> , 128 S.Ct. 558, 574, 169 L.Ed. 2d. 481	
pg. 13	(Dec. 10, 2007)
<u>Rita v. United States</u> , 127 S.Ct. 2456, 2469, 168 L.Ed, 203	
pg. 13	

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<u>Medeiros v. Shimoda</u> , 889 F.2d 819, 825 (9th Cir.)	
pg. 10	
<u>Ring v. Arizona</u>	
pg. 3	
<u>Rummel v. Estella</u> , 445 U.S. 263, 284-85 (1980)	
pg. 23	
<u>Solem v. Helm</u> , 436 U.S. 277, 290 (1983)	
pg(s) 22, 23	
<u>United States v. Ameline</u> , 376 F. 3d 967 (9th Cir. 2004)	
pg(s) 6, 20	
<u>United States v. Ayala</u> , 894 F. 2d 425 (DC Cir. 1990)	
pg 20	
<u>United States v. Blakely</u>	
pg(s) 3, 6, 7	
<u>United States v. Bravo-Diaz</u> , 995 (9th Cir. 2002)	
pg. 1	
<u>United States v. Cotton</u> , 535 U.S. 625, 152 L.Ed. 2d 860, 122	
pg(s) 3, 7, 17	S.Ct. 1781(2003)
<u>United States v. Harris</u>	
pg. 3	
<u>United States v. John Eric O'Neal</u> , CR-96-557-DDP-3	
pg. 4	CV-00-12004-DDP-4
<u>United States v. Frederick Lamar Hamilton</u> , CR-96-557-DDP-1	
pg. 4	
<u>United States v. Morgan</u> , 346 U.S. 502, 510, 74 S.Ct 247, 98,	
pg(s) 1, 2, 3	L.Ed. 248 (1954)
<u>United States v. Miller</u> , 197 F.3d at 646	
pg(s) 14, 15	
<u>United States v. Salgado</u> , 692 F. Supp at 1267-69	
pg. 24	

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<u>United States v. Valdez-Pacheco</u> , 237 F. 3d 1077, 1080 pg(s) 1, 7, 8, 10	(9th Cir. 2001)
<u>United States v. Velasco-Herdia</u> , F.3d 963	(9th Cir. 2001)
pg. 21	
<u>Watts v. United States</u> , 841 F.2d 275, 277	(9th Cir. 1988)
pg. 10	
<u>Weems v. United States</u> , 217 U.S. 349, 382	(1910)
pg. 22	
<u>Williams v. New Orleans Public Service Inc.</u> , 728 F.2d 730, 735 pg(s) 16, 17	(5th Cir. 1984)

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**STATUTES**

**FEDERAL RULES OF APPELATE PROCEDURE (F.R.A.P) Rule 28(j)**  
pg. 12

**FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**

F.R.Civ.P. Rule 60	pg. 6
60(b)	pg. 6
60(b)(4)	pg. 6, 24
60(b)(6)	pg. 2, 6, 16
63	pg. 4, 6, 8, 13, 14
15(d)	pg. 9
18	pg. 4
19	pg. 4

**FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDLEINES**

pg(s) 4, 16, 18, 20

**7 Am. Jur. 2d Audita Querla § 1**  
pg. 9

**18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)**  
pg. 24

**21 U.S.C**

841(a)(1)	pg. 15, 17, 19
841(b)	pg. 15
841(b)(1)A B or C	pg. 15, 16, 17, 18

**28 U.S.C. § 1651**  
pg(s) 7, 8

**28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)**  
pg(s) 1, 2, 4, 10

**28 U.S.C. § 2254**  
pg. 8

**28 U.S.C. § 2255**  
pg(s) 3, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14